



The 0-1 Outcomes Feature Selection Problem : a Chi-2 Approach

Cyril Duron, Jean-Marie Proth

► To cite this version:

Cyril Duron, Jean-Marie Proth. The 0-1 Outcomes Feature Selection Problem : a Chi-2 Approach. [Research Report] RR-4709, INRIA. 2003, pp.10. inria-00071877

HAL Id: inria-00071877

<https://inria.hal.science/inria-00071877>

Submitted on 23 May 2006

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



INSTITUT NATIONAL DE RECHERCHE EN INFORMATIQUE ET EN AUTOMATIQUE

The 0-1 Outcomes Feature Selection Problem : a Chi-2 Approach

Cyril Duron — Jean-Marie Proth

N° 4709

Janvier 2003

THÈME 4

A large blue rectangle occupies the lower half of the page. Overlaid on it is a large, light gray stylized 'R' logo. To the right of the 'R', the words 'Rapport de recherche' are written in a white serif font. A horizontal gray brushstroke is positioned below the text.

*Rapport
de recherche*

The 0-1 Outcomes Feature Selection Problem : a Chi-2 Approach

Cyril Duron ^{*†}, Jean-Marie Proth ^{‡†}

Thème 4 — Simulation et optimisation
de systèmes complexes
Projet Sagep

Rapport de recherche n° 4709 — Janvier 2003 — 10 pages

Abstract: This paper addresses the 0-1 outcome feature selection problem. In such a problem, a set of features leads to an outcome that is 0 or 1, depending upon the values of the features. The goal is to extract subsets of features that characterize at best outcome 1. This kind of problem arises in medical analysis, quality control and, generally, in any domain that requires series of expensive tests to evaluate the state of a system.

Key-words: Feature selection, Data mining, Chi-2 analysis

* Corresponding author. E-mail : duron_ca@yahoo.fr, Phone : 00 33 (0)3 87 31 54 85 Fax : 00 33 (0)3 87 31 54 78

† Location : Inria / Sagep, UFR Scientifique, Université de Metz, Ile du Saulcy, 57000 Metz

‡ Corresponding author. E-mail : proth@loria.fr, Phone : 00 33 (0)3 87 31 54 58 Fax : 00 33 (0)3 87 31 54 78

Le Problème de Sélection de Caractéristiques de Type 0-1 : Une approche utilisant le Chi-2.

Résumé : Ce papier concerne le problème de la sélection de caractéristiques de type 0-1. Dans le problème que nous considérons, un ensemble de caractéristiques conduit à une décision motivée par les valeurs de cet ensemble, et caractérisée par un 0 ou un 1. Le but est d'extraire des sous-ensembles de caractéristiques qui caractérisent au mieux la décision 1. Ce type de problème est courant dans le domaine de l'analyse de données médicales, du contrôle de qualité, ou plus généralement, de tout domaine nécessitant des séries de tests onéreux pour évaluer l'état d'un système.

Mots-clés : Sélection de caractéristiques, Forage de données, Analyse Chi-2

1 Introduction

Consider a set of tests that are performed to diagnose cancer, for instance. Each test leads either to a positive result (denoted by 1) or a negative result (denoted by 0). Thus, the results of the tests appear as a sequence of 0 or 1, and the diagnosis, based on the set of results, concludes that the person suffers from cancer (denoted by 1) or not (denoted by 0). But tests are expensive. Furthermore, the result of a test can be wrong or imprecise : it is the reason why several tests are performed. An important problem is to reduce as much as possible the number of tests to perform the diagnosis while keeping the probability of wrong diagnosis as low as possible.

The same problem arises in quality control, where the goal is to select the smallest (and cheapest) sequence of tests to evaluate efficiently the quality of the products.

The outcome feature selection problem is also of importance in :

- manufacturing, to determine the production stages that are of utmost importance for the quality of the products,
- marketing, to define the media that are the best support to promote a product or service,
- oil prospecting, to select the probes that are the most significant,
- finance, to select the ratios of importance.

Thus, the problem addressed in this paper, called feature selection problem, consists in selecting subsets of feature values that characterize at best outcome 1.

Note that :

- Several subsets of features may be used to characterize outcome 1, and the goal is to select the best one in terms of quality of the results, size of the subset and cost related to the use of this subset.
- A subset of k features being selected, it may take 2^k sets of values. Some of these sets characterize outcome 1, other characterize outcome 0. An algorithm should be introduced to decode if a set of values characterize a 1-outcome or a 0-outcome.
- Two constraints should be considered :
 1. The probability of finding an outcome 1 when the outcome is 0 must remain under a given threshold denoted by η in the remainder of this paper.
 2. The proportion of feature values that characterize outcome 1 covered by the subset of features under consideration is greater than a given threshold denoted by α in the remainder of this paper.

In other words, the goal is to extract a subset of tractable features that characterizes at best a given state of the system while keeping the probability of error under a given threshold.

Numerous research works are available in the literature to provide some solutions to the feature selection problem. In their paper, Bradley et al. (1998) propose a mathematical programming approach with a parametric objective function and linear constraints. The objective is to discriminate between the sets of features using a separating plane defined by as few features as possible. In other words, authors are trying to discriminate between the sets of feature values having an outcome equal to 1 and the ones having an outcome equal to 0 using a subset of features that is as small as possible. As they claim, "having a minimal number of features often leads to better generalization and simpler models that can be more easily interpreted". Bredensteiner and Bennett (1998) also propose a solution that is based on a linear program with equilibrium constraints. Quinlan (1990) focuses on techniques that represent classification problems in the form of decision trees. His universe is made with objects (that are sets of feature values in our terminology), these objects belonging to one of the disjoint classes. In our approach, we consider only two classes: the class characterized by outcome 1 and the class characterized by outcome 0. Boros et al. (1997) propose an approach derived from the "Logical Analysis of Data" (LAD) that aims at discovering "hidden structural information in data sets". The problem is presented as a set of observations, an observation being a set of feature values in the vocabulary used in this paper. A feature value is an attribute in Boros's vocabulary. It is assumed that an observation belongs either to the class of positive observations (i.e. outcome 1) or negative observations (i.e. outcome 0). Authors are interested in studying the binarization process that consists of replacing each feature value either by 0 or 1, depending on the sign of the difference between this value and a threshold that has to be defined.

The approach presented hereafter is, as far as we know, totally different from the ones mentioned above. It is based on χ^2 tests that are successively used for :

- selecting the features that discriminate the 0 and 1 outcomes,

- creating the subset of features whose values can be used to characterize at best outcome 1 while avoiding the selection of outcome 1 when the real outcome is 0.

The problem is formalized in section 2. Section 3 presents the χ^2 test applied to select the most significant features. Section 4 is devoted to the building of the optimal set of feature values that characterize outcome 1. In section 4.1, we use a χ^2 test to select the candidate subsets of features. In section 4.2, we show how to use a set of feature values to decide if the corresponding outcome is 0 or 1. Section 4.3 shows how to compute the confidence intervals of the probabilities of successful and wrong decisions concerning the outcomes. In section 4.4, we propose a way to use the previous results to define the optimal subset of feature values and we provide a numerical example. In section 4.5, we summarize the algorithm.

Section 5 is the conclusion.

2 Problem formulation

The data are gathered in two matrices :

- A matrix $A(m_1 * n)$ of 0 and 1 values that corresponds to outcome 1. In this matrix, m_1 is the number of sets of features values and n the number of features under consideration.
- A matrix $B(m_2 * n)$ of 0 and 1 values that corresponds to outcome 0. In this matrix, m_2 is the number of sets of features values and n is, as in matrix A , the number of features under consideration.

We do not address the case of missing values. The objective is to find one subset of features and an algorithm. This algorithm concludes that the outcome is 1 or 0 based on the values of the selected features that :

- leads to the conclusion that the outcome is 1 when it is really 1 with a probability greater than α . This parameter could be 0.99 by instance.
- leads to the conclusion that the outcome is 1 when it is really 0 with a probability less than η . For instance, we may choose $\eta = 0.01$.

In practice, we compute the interval of confidence of these probabilities at a given threshold (0.95 for instance) and compare the lower bound of the first interval of confidence to α and the upper bound of the second to η .

The strategy applied hereafter is twofold :

- selecting the features that discriminate at best the 0 and 1 outcomes,
- gathering the features corresponding to A -columns that can be considered as extracted from the same population.

3 Selection of features having a discriminatory power

Let us consider the j^{th} columns of A and B , $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. The goal is to decide whether these two columns are issued from the same population or not.

We denote by n_1 ($n_1 \leq m_1$) the number of 1 values in the j^{th} column of A and by n_2 ($n_2 \leq m_2$) the number of 1 values in the j^{th} column of B . An estimation of the probability of the 1-value associated to the union of these two columns is :

$$p = \frac{n_1 + n_2}{m_1 + m_2}$$

Thus the χ^2 associated to the j^{th} column of matrix A is :

$$\chi_A^2 = \frac{(n_1 - m_1 p)^2}{m_1 p} + \frac{(m_1 - n_1 - m_1(1 - p))^2}{m_1(1 - p)} = \frac{(n_1 - m_1 p)^2}{m_1 p(1 - p)}$$

Similarly, the χ^2 associated to the j^{th} column of matrix B is :

$$\chi_B^2 = \frac{(n_2 - m_2 p)^2}{m_2 p(1 - p)}$$

Finally, the χ^2 associated to the two columns is : $\chi_j^2 = \chi_A^2 + \chi_B^2$ and the degree of freedom of χ_j^2 is 1, taking into account the fact that p is an estimated value.

Let χ_0^2 be the χ^2 such that :

$$Pr\{\chi_j^2 > \chi_0^2\} = (1 - \alpha)$$

For instance, if $\alpha = 0.99$, then $\chi_0^2 = 6.635$: this value is given by the χ^2 table for a degree of freedom equal to one.

Thus, if χ_j^2 is greater than χ_0^2 , we reject the fact that the j^{th} column of A and the j^{th} column of B are extracted from the same population. More precisely, the probability for this two columns to be extracted from the same population is less than $1 - \alpha$, and thus, this hypothesis can be rejected.

In other words, we consider that the feature corresponding to the j^{th} column of A and B discriminates the outcomes 0 and 1 if $\chi_j^2 > \chi_0^2$.

Indeed, α is chosen big enough to reduce the probability of error.

Making the same computation for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ leads to a subset of features that discriminate the 0 and 1 outcomes.

4 Optimal subsets of features

4.1 Selecting the candidate subsets

At this point of the computation, we have a subset $S \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ of features whose elements have a discriminatory power. For a given $j \in S$, the bigger χ_j^2 , the stronger the discriminatory power. But if we consider, for instance, two features j_1 and j_2 belonging to S , it may happen that the columns j_1 and j_2 of matrix A cannot be considered as extracted from the same population. In other words, several subsets S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k , with $\bigcup_{k=1}^K S_k = S$, may characterize outcome 1. The goal of this section is to extract these subsets from S and select the ones that leads to the lowest error ratio.

Considering features j_1 and j_2 mentioned above, the objective is to decide whether they are extracted from the same population or not. In terms of columns of matrix A , we have to decide whether columns j_1 and j_2 are independent from each other or not.

Let a_{ij} be the element of row i and column j of A . Indeed, a_{ij} is equal to 0 or 1. A pair (a_{i,j_1}, a_{i,j_2}) is either (0,0), (0,1), (1,0) or (1,1).

We denote by $p_{0,0}, p_{0,1}, p_{1,0}$ and $p_{1,1}$ the probabilities of these occurrences, and by :

$p_{u,}, u \in \{0, 1\}$, the probability of u in column j_1 ,

$p_{.,v}, v \in \{0, 1\}$, the probability of v in column j_2 ,

Indeed, since the feature values are independant from each other : $p_{u,v} = p_{u,} * p_{.,v}$

To apply the χ^2 test, we have to estimate $p_{0,}, p_{1,}, p_{.,0}$ and $p_{.,1}$. The best estimation of these probabilities is : $p_{0,} = \frac{k_{0,0} + k_{0,1}}{m_1}$, where $k_{u,v}$ is the number of pairs (u, v) in columns (j_1, j_2) of matrix A .

Similarly : $p_{1,} = \frac{k_{1,0} + k_{1,1}}{m_1}$, $p_{.,0} = \frac{k_{0,0} + k_{1,0}}{m_1}$, $p_{.,1} = \frac{k_{0,1} + k_{1,1}}{m_1}$

The χ^2 of a pair of columns j_1 and j_2 is :

$$\chi_{j_1, j_2}^2 = \frac{(k_{0,0} - m_1 p_{0,} p_{.,0})^2}{m_1 p_{0,} p_{.,0}} + \frac{(k_{1,1} - m_1 p_{1,} p_{.,1})^2}{m_1 p_{1,} p_{.,1}} + \frac{(k_{0,1} - m_1 p_{0,} p_{.,1})^2}{m_1 p_{0,} p_{.,1}} + \frac{(k_{1,0} - m_1 p_{1,} p_{.,0})^2}{m_1 p_{1,} p_{.,0}}$$

Replacing the probabilities by their estimation, we obtain :

$$\chi_{j_1, j_2}^2 = m_1 \left(\frac{k_{0,0}^2}{k_{0,} k_{.,0}} + \frac{k_{1,1}^2}{k_{1,} k_{.,1}} + \frac{k_{0,1}^2}{k_{0,} k_{.,1}} + \frac{k_{1,0}^2}{k_{1,} k_{.,0}} - 1 \right) \quad (1)$$

We estimated four parameters (the probabilities) that are linked by two relations : $p_{1,} + p_{0,} = 1$ and $p_{.,1} + p_{.,0} = 1$

As a consequence, the number of parameters to take into account is $4 - 2 = 2$. Since the probability rule concerns binary variables, we have to subtract 1 from the number of parameters to take into account in order to obtain the number of degrees of freedom. Finally, the degree of freedom is 1.

The feature j_1 and j_2 are dependant if χ_{j_1, j_2}^2 does not exceed the value χ_0^2 such that : $Pr\{\chi_{j_1, j_2}^2 > \chi_0^2\} = 1 - \alpha$ where α is large (0.99 for instance).

This test allows us to match features that collaborate in characterizing the 1-outcome. Applying the test to each pair (j_1, j_2) , $j_1, j_2 \in S$, we obtain χ_{j_1, j_2}^2 . We select the pairs of features that depend on each other, or in other words, that lead to $\chi_{j_1, j_2}^2 \leq \chi_0^2$.

We then consider the subsets made with three features. They are built based on this rule : (j_1, j_2, j_3) is selected if and only if (j_1, j_2) , (j_1, j_3) and (j_2, j_3) have been selected in the previous step.

We can continue the extension of the set in the same way : (j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4) is select if and only if (j_1, j_2) , (j_2, j_3) , (j_3, j_4) (j_1, j_3) , (j_1, j_4) and (j_2, j_4) have been selected at step 2, and so on.

Assume, for instance, that 10 features have been selected for their discriminatory power.

Starting from those features, we can create $C_{10}^2 = 45$ pairs of features. After computing the χ_{j_1, j_2}^2 of each pair (j_1, j_2) , we select the pairs whose $\chi_{j_1, j_2}^2 < \chi_0^2$. From this set of selected pairs, we can derive the subsets of 3, 4, ..., 10 elements, if any.

At this stage of the computation, we have a collection of subsets made with 2, 3, ..., k elements. The goal is to select the *best* subset, taking into account the fact that the selection should be based on three criteria :

- the selected subset should be able to find out outcome 1 with a probability as close as possible to 1,
- the selected subset should be able to avoid selecting outcome 1 when the outcome is 0 : the probability to select outcome 1 in this case should be as close as possible to 0,
- the selected subset should be as small as possible or, alternatively, the use of this subset should be as cheap as possible.

4.2 The algorithm to extract the outcome

At this point of the explanation, we have several subsets of features and we associate, to each of these features, either 0 or 1, depending on the binary value that is in a majority in the corresponding column of A .

We also assume that, for each feature j , we know the probability p_j that the value taken by the feature is wrong for outcome 1. If j is a pathology analysis, p_j is the probability that the result of analysis is wrong or meaningless for output 1.

Consider a set E of R features and assume that r_1 features take the wrong value. The probability that this set corresponds to a 1 output is :

$$Q_E = \prod_{j \in E_1} p_j \cdot \prod_{j \in E_2} (1 - p_j) \quad (2)$$

where E_1 is the set of r_1 feature values that do not correspond to the values required by outcome 1 and E_2 is the set of $R - r_1$ feature values that correspond to the value required by outcome 1.

Indeed, $E_1 \cup E_2 = E$.

The same approach is used to evaluate a set of features with regard to outcome 0. Let q_j be the probability that the value taken by feature j is wrong, when outcome is 0. Consider a set F of R features and assume that r_2 features take the wrong value with regard to output 0, that is a value that does not correspond to output 0.

Let F_1 the set of r_2 features that are wrong with regard to output 0 and F_2 the set of $R - r_2$ features that fit with output 0. The probability that set F corresponds to output 0 is :

$$H_F = \prod_{j \in F_1} q_j \cdot \prod_{j \in F_2} (1 - q_j) \quad (3)$$

and $F_1 \cup F_2 = F$.

Thus, when a set L of feature values is given, we compute Q_L and H_L . If $Q_L > H_L$, we decide that L corresponds to output 1, otherwise we decide that L corresponds to output 0.

The values of the probabilities p_j and q_j are evaluated as follows. Assume that the column j of a matrix A contains n_1 ($n_1 \leq m_1$) values that are different from the value required for output 1. Then we set :

$$p_j = \frac{n_1}{m_1}$$

Similarly, if the column j of matrix B contains n_2 ($n_2 \leq m_2$) values that are different from the value required for output 0, then we set :

$$q_j = \frac{n_2}{m_2}$$

Using this approach, we are now able to decide whether a set of feature values defines an output 0 or 1.

4.3 Evaluation of the probabilities

For each subset, we thus have to evaluate two probabilities. Assume, for instance, that $k_1 \geq m_1$ is the number of 1-outcomes that have been found in A based on the diagnosis rule presented in section 4.2. The value of m_1 is supposed to be *large enough*, say greater than or equal to 20. In this case, the random variable:

$$\frac{\sqrt{m_1}}{\sigma_1} \left(\frac{k_1}{m_1} - M_1 \right) \quad (4)$$

follows a Gaussian distribution of mean value 0 and standard deviation 1. In this formulation, M_1 is the mean value of the number of 1-outcomes that have been found in A , and σ_1 is the related standard deviation. In our example,

$$\sigma_1 \sim \sqrt{\frac{k_1(m_1 - k_1)}{m_1(m_1 - 1)}} \quad (5)$$

Replacing σ_1 in (4) by its evaluation (5), we can say that :

$$\sqrt{\frac{m_1^2(m_1 - k_1)}{k_1(m_1 - k_1)}} \left(\frac{k_1}{m_1} - M_1 \right)$$

follows a Gaussian distribution of mean value 0 and standard deviation 1. In other words :

$$P_2\{-a \leq \sqrt{\frac{m_1^2(m_1 - k_1)}{k_1(m_1 - k_1)}} \left(\frac{k_1}{m_1} - M_1 \right) \leq a\} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-a}^{+a} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} dx \quad (6)$$

Assume that we want to evaluate M_1 with a confidence probability of 0.95. The statistic table related to the Gaussian distribution provides $a = 1.96$.

We derive, from (6) :

$$\frac{k_1}{m_1} - 1.96 \sqrt{\frac{k_1(m_1 - k_1)}{m_1^2(m_1 - 1)}} \leq M_1 \leq \frac{k_1}{m_1} + 1.96 \sqrt{\frac{k_1(m_1 - k_1)}{m_1^2(m_1 - 1)}}$$

with a probability equal to 0.95. The lower and upper bounds of M_1 define the so-called *confidence interval* of M_1 at the threshold 0.95.

Similarly, if M_2 is the mean value of the 1-outcome wrongly selected instead of a 0-outcome, and k_2 the number of wrongly selected 1-outcomes in matrix B , then :

$$\frac{k_2}{m_2} - 1.96 \sqrt{\frac{k_2(m_2 - k_2)}{m_2^2(m_2 - 1)}} \leq M_2 \leq \frac{k_2}{m_2} + 1.96 \sqrt{\frac{k_2(m_2 - k_2)}{m_2^2(m_2 - 1)}}$$

4.4 Selecting the optimal subset : an example

We want to select a subset such that M_1 is as close as possible to 1 and M_2 to 0.

Using the previous limits, we will choose a subset having a lower limit of the confidence interval of M_1 as big as possible and an upper limit of the confidence interval of M_2 as low as possible.

The example presented here has been obtained as follows :

We generated two matrices $A(60 * 14)$ and $B(60 * 14)$ as follows :

1. We defined a key, that is a sequence of 14 elements that are either 0 or 1 or *.
2. To generate a feature value of A , we proceed as follows :
 - if this value corresponds to 0 in the key, it will be 0 with the probability 0.9 and 1 with the probability 0.1
 - if this value corresponds to 1 in the key, it will be 1 with the probability 0.9 and 0 with the probability 0.1.
 - if this value corresponds to * in the key, it will be 1 with the probability 0.5 and 0 with the same probability.
3. B is generated similarly, starting from the key obtained by changing 0 in 1 and 1 in 0 in the previous key.

Table 1: Selection of the pairs of features

Pairs	χ^2	A : Test efficiency			B : Errors		
		Min Prob.	Probability	Max Prob.	Min Prob.	Probability	Max Prob.
(1,3)	0.1478	0.9283	0.9667	1	0.05	0.0035	0.0965
(1,4)	0.2256	0.8147	0.8833	0.9518	0	0	0
(1,8)	0.4762	1	1	1	0.0359	0.1	0.1640
(1,10)	0.07264	0.8576	0.9167	0.9757	0	0.0167	0.044
(1,12)	0.7563	0.8801	0.9333	0.9866	0.0035	0.05	0.09653
(1,14)	1.0714	0.956	0.9833	1	0.1	0.1640	0.0359
(3,4)	0.1089	0.9283	0.9666	1	0.0034	0.05	0.0965
(3,8)	0.2299	0.9283	0.9667	1	0.0034	0.05	0.09653
(3,10)	0.0350	0.9034	0.95	0.9965	0	0.0333	0.0716
(3,12)	1.9878	0.9283	0.9667	1	0.0035	0.05	0.0965
(3,14)	0.2299	0.9283	0.9667	1	0.0035	0.05	0.0965
(4,8)	0.3509	0.9035	0.95	0.9965	0.0134	0.0667	0.1199
(4,10)	0.0535	0.8801	0.9334	0.9867	0	.0167	0.044
(4,12)	6.6116	0.9035	0.95	0.9965	0.0134	0.0667	0.1199
(4,14)	0.3509	0.9035	0.95	0.9965	0.0134	0.0667	0.1199
(8,10)	0.1129	0.8147	0.8833	0.9519	0	0.0167	0.044
(8,12)	0.0145	0.956	0.9833	1	0.0607	0.1333	0.2059
(8,14)	0.3292	0.956	0.9833	1	0.0359	0.1	0.1641
(10,12)	0.1795	0.956	0.9833	1	0.0607	0.1333	0.2059
(10,14)	0.1129	0.8148	0.8833	0.9519	0	0	0
(12,14)	0.0145	0.956	0.9833	1	0.0675	0.1333	0.2059

In our example, the key is :

1	*	1	1	*	*	*	1	*	0	*	0	*	0
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

We select features (1,3,4,8,10,12,14) by applying the test introduced in section 3. We observe that the selected features are those corresponding to the elements of the key that are different from *. From this set of features, we can extract $C_7^2=21$ pairs of features.

All these pairs of feature are selected using the second test (see section 4.1). Table 1 provides the results of this selection.

Column 1 provides the pairs that have been selected. The value of χ^2 is given in the second column. This value should be less than 6.635 that corresponds to a probability of 0.99.

The three next columns provide the lower bound, the evaluation and the upper bound of the probability of success (threshold 0.95) when using the pair to evaluate a 1-output. The last three columns provide similar informations concerning the probability of concluding that the output is 1 when it is 0.

As table 1 shows, none of the pairs is perfect. Note that pair (1,8) is perfect to extract a 1-outcome, but may conclude that the outcome is 1 when it is 0. Pair (10,14) never concludes that the output is 1 when it is 0, but its performance is quite bad for recognizing a 1 output.

Considering the sets composed of three features, we observe that sets (1,3,8) and (1,4,8) are with a confidence interval [1,1] for the probability of extracting a 1-output and the confidence interval [0,0] for extracting a 1-output instead of a 0-output : we will select one of these sets.

4.5 The algorithm

To summarize, the algorithm is as follows :

1. Selecting the features having a discriminatory power.

Let j be a feature. We compute $\chi_j^2 = \chi_A^2 + \chi_B^2$ as explained in section 3, and we accept or reject a feature depending on χ_0^2 defined according to the probability chosen by the user. If $\chi_j^2 > \chi_0^2$, we decide that feature j has a discriminatory power.

2. For each pair (j_1, j_2) of features, j_1 and j_2 being the features selected in the previous step, compute χ_{j_1, j_2}^2 (see (1)). If $\chi_{j_1, j_2}^2 < \chi_0^2$, then (j_1, j_2) is selected since this means that features j_1 and j_2 are complementary.
3. Compute the subsets of features having more than two elements starting from the pairs obtained in step 2, as explained in section 4.1.
4. For each subset of two elements and more, evaluate their efficiency with regard to :
 - their ability to detect a 1-output,
 - their ability not to detect a 1-output when the output is 0.

This leads to a confidence interval as explained in section 4.3.

5. Select the subset. The decision to be made is of a multi-criteria type, since we have to choose :
 - a maximum value for the lower bound of the confidence interval of the probability to detect the 1-outcomes,
 - a minimum value for the upper bound of the confidence interval of the probability to detect a 1-outcome instead of a 0-outcome,
 - the cost associated to the sets. In the previous example, the cost was the number of components in the subset.

5 Conclusion

In this article, we used the χ^2 -test to extract discriminatory features. We then build sets containing discriminatory features whose values lead to the diagnosis.

Usually, one feature is not enough to conclude if the output is 0 or 1, due to the fact that tests may lead to wrong and unprecise results. Several features may correct each other and provide a safer result. In the numerical examples that have been developed, we observed that the efficiency first increases, and then decreases with the number of features in the set.

The next step will be to consider the case of missing data, as well as the case when the number of values taken by the features is greater than two.

References

- [1] M. R. Anderberg. *Cluster analysis for applications*. Academic Press, New York, 1973.
- [2] G. K. Bhattacharyya and R. A. Johnson. *Statistical concepts and methods*. Wiley, New York, 1977.
- [3] E. Boros, P. L. Hammer, T. Ibaraki, and A. Kogan. Logical analysis of numerical data. *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 79, pp. 163-190, 1997.
- [4] P. S. Bradley, O. L. Mangasarian, and W. N. Street. Feature selection via mathematical programming. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, vol. 10, n° 2, pp. 209-217, 1998.
- [5] E. J. Bredensteiner and K. P. Bennett. Feature minimization within decision trees. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, vol. 10, pp. 111-126, 1998.
- [6] J. C. Deville and G. Saporta. Correspondence analysis with an extension towards nominal time series. *Journal of econometrics*, vol. 22, pp. 169-189, 1983.
- [7] R. Gittins. *Canonical Analysis*. Springer Verlag, New York, 1984.
- [8] B. Green. *Analyzing multivariate data*. Winston, New York, 1978.
- [9] M. J. Greenacre. *Theory and application of correspondence analysis*. Academic Press, New York, 1984.
- [10] J. R. Quinlan. Decision trees and decisionmaking. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*, vol. 20, n°2, pp. 339-346, 1990.



Unité de recherche INRIA Lorraine
LORIA, Technopôle de Nancy-Brabois - Campus scientifique
615, rue du Jardin Botanique - BP 101 - 54602 Villers-lès-Nancy Cedex (France)

Unité de recherche INRIA Rennes : IRISA, Campus universitaire de Beaulieu - 35042 Rennes Cedex (France)
Unité de recherche INRIA Rhône-Alpes : 655, avenue de l'Europe - 38330 Montbonnot-St-Martin (France)
Unité de recherche INRIA Rocquencourt : Domaine de Voluceau - Rocquencourt - BP 105 - 78153 Le Chesnay Cedex (France)
Unité de recherche INRIA Sophia Antipolis : 2004, route des Lucioles - BP 93 - 06902 Sophia Antipolis Cedex (France)

Éditeur
INRIA - Domaine de Voluceau - Rocquencourt, BP 105 - 78153 Le Chesnay Cedex (France)
<http://www.inria.fr>
ISSN 0249-6399